

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant appreciates the allowability of claims 1-24.

Claims 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,426,424 to Vanden Heuvel (hereinafter "Vanden Heuvel") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,892 to Helferich (hereinafter "Helferich") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,239,679 to Murai (hereinafter "Murai"). For the following reasons, the rejection is again respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Vanden Heuvel, Helferich nor Murai teaches or suggests "erasing concerned messages *collectively*," as required. With reference to Helfreich, the Examiner states: "One of ordinary skill in the art understand that [when] a user select an erase function after the received message is read, the received message is marked in order for the pager transceiver CPU knows that a particular message is erased after the process function is performed." This statement presumes that more than one message can be marked for deletion by the user before the process function is performed, thus deleting the messages collectively. Nothing in the record supports the Examiner's statement.

On the contrary, Applicant respectfully submits that Helferich performs the process function immediately after a message is marked for deletion by a user and thus the messages are deleted individually. Fig. 8 depicts a flow diagram of user selectable functions, including "erase message" (116). As described at column 10, lines 45-47, "FIG. 9 depicts processing performed by the paging transceiver 100 *in response to the selection of any one of the functions* 112 to 117 shown in FIG. 8" (emphasis added). Thus, once a user selects the "erase message" function (116), the paging transceiver proceeds to step 131, followed by steps 132 and 133, wherein the message is erased. The paging transceiver of Helferich does not wait for a step of collective erasing, as

Appl. No. 09/332,298  
Amdt. Dated December 17, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2003

in the claimed invention, but rather erases the message upon selection by the user. Since every limitation of the claim is not taught or suggested by Venden Heuvel, Helferich, Murai or any combination thereof, claim 25 and its dependent claims 26-28 are patentable over the prior art of record.


In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 31812.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:



Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: 12/17/03